



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,844	02/25/2004	John Douglas Methot	ORACL-01438US1	2952
80548	7590	07/25/2008	EXAMINER	
Fliesler Meyer LLP 650 California Street 14th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108				KEATON, SHERROD L
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2175				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,844	METHOT, JOHN DOUGLAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sherrod Keaton	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1, 9, 12, 15-18 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 9, 12, 15-18 and, 20-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the RCE filing on 5-7-08. Claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-14, 19 have been canceled and Claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18 and 20-24 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 of instant application does not specify that the claimed invention includes hardware. As such, the language of the claim merely describes a computer program per se. This raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine, which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US 2003/0028364 A1) in view of Sullivan (US 20030016238 A1), and Cohen (US 7024658 B1).

Claim 1: Chan discloses a system for extending online help for an integrated development environment, comprising:
processing documentation content upon import of the integrated development environment extension wherein the documentation content includes context sensitive help topics (Page 1, Paragraph 5);
but does not explicitly disclose
displaying operations for a help system wherein search capabilities and table of contents are automatically updated after the integrated development environment extension is imported. However Sullivan discloses a context based help engine and

dynamic help and further discloses displaying updated help topics to user when context has changed (Page 7, Paragraph 73). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have updates of help topics when an extension is added in Chan as taught by Sullivan. One would have been motivated to update the help system because it allows user to conduct thorough queries improving user efficiency.

Chan also does not explicitly disclose the help display being configured to display content in a web browser. However Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being configured to display content in a web browser (Column 2, Lines 3-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to display content in a web browser of the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to include the help display content in a web browser in order to allow user access multiple help files through hyperlinked pages.

Cohen further discloses wherein when the extension is imported, documentation for the extension is integrated with the help system during the import of the extension. (Column 9, Line 60-Column 10, Line 54). Here the system allows for imports and updates without restarting the application (dynamic) meaning that the data is imported during integration.

Therefore it would have been obvious to provide the functionality of integrating data during an extension in the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to provide the dynamic integration to improve the operability of the system.

Claim 9: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 1 above and further discloses that the help system can be integrated with an extension installation mechanism (Chan Page 2, Paragraph 15-16).

Claim 12: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 1 above and Cohen further discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being externally controllable (Column 3, Lines 5-20).

Claim 15: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose a help system including context-sensitive help topics as in Claim 1 above and further disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID (Chan Page 7, Paragraph 60-61).

Claim 16: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 15 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified Java class (Chan Page 1 Paragraph 6-8).

Claim 17: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 15 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified name from a non-Java resource (Chan Page 1 Paragraph 6-8).

Claim 18: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose a system as in claim 1 above wherein the documentation content is in HTML or XML format (Chan Page 3, Paragraph 25).

Claim 21: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above wherein the IDE widgets, controls, and control properties are associated with the documentation topics that can be automatically displayed in the help system when requested by a user performing a context sensitive help gesture (Chan Figure 2; 20). The widgets are provided when using the help system.

Claim 22: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose a system of claim 1 and further disclose wherein a control is installed, documentation for the control is integrated with the help

system during the installation of the control (Cohen: Column 9, Line 60-Column 10, Line 54). Here the system allows for imports and updates without restarting the application (dynamic) meaning that the data is imported during integration.

Claim 23: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose a system of claim 1 and further disclose wherein each control class, method, callback, field and property has a unique context ID. (Cohen: Column 8, Line 53-Column 9, Line 15). Here code is provided that defines the content, layout etc. therefore the data included in that file will contain unique context ID for that particular content.

Claim 24: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose a system of claim 1 and further disclose wherein the integrated development environment issues a context id to the help display when a context-sensitive help gesture is performed. (Cohen: Column 8, Line 53-Column 9, Line 15). Here code is provided that defines the content, layout etc. therefore the data included in that file will contain unique context ID for that particular content allowing for context sensitive help.

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US 2003/0028364 A1) ,Sullivan (US 20030016238 A1), and Cohen (US 7024658 B1) as applied to claim 1 in further view of Chong et al (“Chong” US 20020184610 A1)

Claim 20: Chan, Sullivan and Cohen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above but do not explicitly disclose that the documentation content can support delivery of help for a particular component in a JAR file. However Chong discloses that component can support a JAR file (Page 30, Paragraph 436). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide documentation of the modified Chan to support a JAR file as taught by Chong. One would have been motivated to provide this support to improve functionality and operability of the system.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571)

270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK
7-14-08

/William L. Bashore/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175